4/23/69

Dear Dick,

Your very interesting letter of 4/18 arrived this morning. I answer it in haste to be able to mail this tonight, without having read the enclosed "The Oswald Frame".

First let me tell you what I have arrange and what I have probably arranged, so you will know, so you can utilize these facilities, so you can make suggestions, etc.

I have located two NRA masters in the area who will likely be willing to help. The acquaintance I asked to be my photogrpsher (excellent still photographer who can also do fine closeup work and has 16mm Bolex movie available) happens to be a real and expert gun buff. I have not wanted to go too fast with him, but because he is very interested and is lining other things up for me, I expect to invite him to go to the Archives with me. He has also made some simple, practical suggestions (like cutting the fired and unfired shells lengthwise and taking pictures of the tests). One of these masters is with the Bureau of Standards. Another is so expert in handguns he was asked to join the Smithsonian. I have also located two men with the Remington 760. Remarkable, in this small area, is it not? Real, genuine, authentic experts, and on my side!

I have also been checking on the ammo. I have the Remington-Peters catalogue, where the ammo is pictured on pp 32-3. This catalogue is entitled, 1969 Sporting Firearms and Ammunition". In cross section the illustrated bullets do not have two two "rooms", as you call them. What you seem to have illustrated for me is the Nosler "Partition" bullet, on which I also have the spec sheet. Your correspondence course has really gotten me interested! Not from catalogues I learn the 30.06 is available in 150, 180 and 220 grain loads. I plan some inquiries. If I get to them today I'll enclose a copy. However, I think with John unwilling to share in LOOK, we should keep this to ourselves. I will not be telling Gary until everything is done for he can make no contribution. It also is unfair to John to burden him with confidences when he may be a competitor (so far as I personally am concerned, he now is). This does not mean not to help him. What help in what he is doing I can provide, I will. If I do not return to this remind me of my conversation with my agent a month ago. If I write him today, I'll enclose a copy of that, too.

With the rifle, 80 rounds of Westrn ammo, six disarmed entirely and the bullets replaced, six disarmed and the bullet replaced but the primer intact, and a total of five clips, plus a box of Norma to use where the Western is not essential, and with experts and an extremely proficient photographer, I think I can proceed to take the pictures we need from what you have already sent. However, if you have the time, it might be good if you lay out a script. Inlcude Frazier and that 15-yard range target and the projection. Here is what I have in mind with the M-6 (on the Remington 30-06 I have in mind a ~~diagonal~~ LONG cut of the bullet, firing various loads and bullets into various objects at the exact distance, including dead animals and possibly gelatin, with pictures of each).: Setting the sight to be just Frazier's distance off at 15 and doing it for the right distances, measuring the point hit from bullseye for error; photographing the clip falling out (using blowsups of the movie if we do not get good stills); fired and unfired cases, cross-section as above; and what you laid out earlier and possibly in more detail in "The Oswald Frame", on the marking of the cases, the dent in the front, the blot-face markings, etc. Here we can use my rifle to show what happens. I may be able to get a competent police expert to do the lab

is needed because two from an out-of-town department are coming
is week in connection with something unrelated, where I am helping them.
n get large negatives of the small objects. They, in turn, can be blown
p considerably. It is remarkable good fortune to have an excellent photographer who is interested and well equipped and whose knowledge of the technical aspects seems to be at least as good as yours. No offense intended with the "ta least". He has gone into many things with me you have not, which does not mean you are unaware of them. We have had personal conversation, he and I, while you and I are limited to letters.

Now, if I can get him to go to the Archives with me, their regulations, unless changed, are that I can take the pictures but not touch the stuff or that they will take the pictures with my equipment, I do not recall which. I would like to take polaroids, which I can take with me if they do not require also that they develop, and the reguler film shots. My own Polaroid is the professional model with the Zeiss lens. It stops down to f45. Tom's equipment is the best. He is always updating it so I do not know what he now has. As soon as I get a definitive listing from you of what you want taken at the Archives, I will make arrangements with them and then speak to Tom to see if he'd like to go. He is an insurance man, so his time can be his own, but he may require notice. Meanwhile, if I let his interest continue to grow, I think it more likely that he will want to do this. Not that the Archives photogrpaher did not take excellent shots of 399 for me, exactly the way I wanted them. But Tom also knows something about the technical aspects of what interests us and this way we'll have exclusive negatives, I think. I take up your letter from the top here.

Non-technical publication: why not figure on both? I'll return to one angle with NRA and another with agent. I think it would be wrong to omit Frazier unless the prospective publication is afraid to tangle with the FBI. I know one that is not. Here I mean trajectories.

CE557: If we can get flash to show the inside, should we try or should we restrict to what I plan, above? We know theirs are fired, too, or they say they are. You say they are important, such pictures, "for other reasons". If any of these require special knowledge, we should have it before I go to the Archives.

Duplicating CE 558: I presume this means we ask them to remove the bolt from the rifle. If they refuse, can we get along with the slight distortion? Do we also want a print of their 558? More than one? Can we get the kind of extractor picture you want if the bolt is not removed? Can we eliminate other possibilities of any marks on the rim of CE543 by covering the shell with some material, like a plastic? This we can do with my rifle, which I have now.

I think it is safe to assume a 30.06 was the murder weapon, for otherwise there'd be no point in planting one, would there? Would your explanations of what I take to be the Mosler be true of the Peters? Or does Peters also make this and I have not yet discovered proof? I am still looking, or having my gun shop look. Also, is not the rear section less likely to mushroom?

That mark on the windowsill bit has been of interest to me since the Oswald fiction, with the boxes, where there is also a mark alleged to have been of the rifle. You have expanded my knowledge considerably with the "vibration" explanation. I did not know <u>why</u>, only that. I find, having spoken to three experts since getting your letter, that this is common knowledge, which makes it even more significant. This means using this as evidence, with competent experts [illegible] the pressure deliberate, not accidental, in both cases.

Patent rights, Mickey the framing

So, in the pucture-taking, we'll have the expert shoot resting the rifle on wood and prone or whatever other way he wants, at the same target, maybe at different targets that can then be overlaid. Both rifles.

By the way, do you need a clip? They didn't mail the one I asked be mailed to you. Or, is John's supply short? If it is so you want me to replace the one he let you have, I will. There is a good supply here, 25¢ each, military type. And because you are a member of the NRA, would you mind writing Peters for me, so the letter will not have a flag on it, and ask for specs on all the different types and loads for the 30.06 Gamemaster 760?

Do not bother to dig up exact figures on the resting rifle but if you come accross it, fine. Eventually, I would want it. The pictures will serve immediate purposes.

I do urge that you stay away from the NRA on this subject or anything they can guess is this subject because, alas, dear faithful member, they are also involved. I cannot tell you the entire story save face to face, but they did some testing for the government and they have been silent, knowing the truth. Why not Shelley Braverman and "Guns". He is on our side and they have published him on this-but only after all the work is done. Here is the "technical" market alluded to above. If you feel it important to have the NRA in on it, then I strongly recommend only after publication is assured.

Press conference: wrong approach, last resort. Publication, in connection with which a press conference, yes. Then there is sponsorship for the press conference. Looking toward that day I had sent a message to a man I believe I can trust with foreign TV to see if I could interest him in taking the pictures before I thought of this friend. He was never in any of the times I phoned him. I just sent this new message Saturday, when another correspondent, also from his country, was up for dinner. But several things may mitigate against this, one is the Nichols-LOOK thing. First, we do not want to horn in on John. Of course, we want the work completed before we say anything to anyone. To me, and I must point out I could be selfish subconsciously, that although I may not think it my beliefs might be influenced, as with everything, I am opposed to one-shot sensations if there is an alternative. This is only part of the story of the framing of Oswald. I have the material for a book on that and plan to limit it to a third of a book, in AGENT OSWALD. And what I have is really sensational. I think one appect fortifies the others. What I would, without considering it at length, prefer is what Thompson did in Six Seconds, a separate part or parts by you, in your name, on those things that you alone conceived and did, whether or not you did them with help. Particularly the cases and the trajectories. There is some time before you would be ready for a press conference, so give me your offhand opinion and then think it over. Meanwhile, I am fairly certain Marty Singer, of Saga, would go for that if I were to offer it to him or you were to say I suggested it. I could phone him at the right time-which is not until after all the work is done.

Now there are possibilities at two larger magazines, but I do not say probabilities. I have a contact at Reader's Digest, to whom I have entrusted some of my work, without results, and I pick up a rumor they are looking for assassination material. I can speak to him of the package when I am in Washington. All the ballistics framing (but the disadvantage is they are not for pictures). When I was in New York a month ago I spoke to two people who can reach LIFE. One is my agent and the other is the friend of a friend kind of connection. I will write. I had broached another aspect. LIFE will be tough, but with something unassailable, they might want it if only to keep it away from others. Especially if they hear LOOK is doing something, also. I have an entre at PLAYBOY. There

is every reason to try and sell what is saleable before giving it away. In my case, it can mean publication of a book that otherwise might never be printed.

Then there is something I have never broached to you and I do now, because of the medium, elliptically. Suppose I can establish the precisely best kind of political connection on this and the related material I have? Would you be willing to have it first used this way or, if it is possible, by this way its use arranged? I have in mind certain people who may be damaged politically if and when the truth comes out unless they are connected with the revelation of truth. I have a one-way connection with one and still another has sent me word he is coming to see me. Among the other alternatives along this line, I can take it to a member of the Commission who I have already seen and who, I have every reason to believe, both trusts me and was deeply disturbed by that with which I entrusted him. There are many possibilities, depending, among other things, on timing and luck. I have been sitting back, awaiting the propitious moment and the committing to paper. This would mean, at the moment, the completion of the autopsy book and the writing of AGENT OSWALD. Lil has had to continue working. When this is finished, perhaps a week or two, my day will be less broken up, she can do part of what I now must, I will not have to be stopping to take and to get her, and I can ream it out. After she cleans up the mess she got so she could clean it up, she will be working but one day a week plus a little home bookkeeping she does. The actual writing will not take too long. It would be good if there were an editor present, however. Then, with the three, I think overwhelming books on the autopsy (I forgot about COUP, but again, once I am clear the time required is not great) books and their evidence and what I have for AGENT OSWADD there will be a case of the "new" material the finks have been asking for that is about unassailable. Not just one, if very dramatic, angle.

I think you are wrong to consider that if the cases had actually been fired it makes any difference. It really doesn't, for they were planted and, naturally, there was no attached bullet. Each had been in this or another weapon at least once (I have forgotten the page of WW, but I cited the cover evidence there). Whether they were fired seems to me to be essentially immaterial, but if they had not been and the FBI suppressed this, then it is more significant than otherwise.

The whole day will be taken up with correspondence!

Sincerely,